IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE
CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO.398 OF 1993

Bhimacharya Balacharya Varkhe-
dakar, Age-41 years,
Occupation: Upadhyaya and
Trustee of Vaidika Dharma
Sampakshaka Sangha, r/o 2300,
Small Dattaghat, Pandharpur,
Dist: Solapur.
(In the capacity of individual
and leader as well as represen-
tative of all followers of
Sanatan Vaidika (Hindu) Dharma
and Vaishnava (Bhagawata)
Sampradaya.) .... Applicant

- Versus -

Prant Officer,
Pandharpur Sub-Division,
Pandharpur.
(In the capacity of individual and
leader as well as representative
of:

1. Executive Officer,
   Vitthal Rukmini Temple
   Committee, Pandharpur.

2. Government of Maharashtra
   State, Prant Office,
   Pandharpur-413 304. .... Respondents

Shri A.Y. Sakhare as Amicus Curiae vide
Order dated 17-6-2003.

Shri K.K. Tated, Asst. Government Pleader,
for the Respondent No.2.

CORAM: R.M.S. KHANDEPARKAR, J.

DATED: NOVEMBER 22, 2004

ORAL JUDGMENT:

1. None present for the respondent No.1. Shri K.K. Tated, A.G.P., for the respondent No.2.

2. The present revision application arises from the order passed on 2-1-1993 in Miscellaneous Civil Appeal No.84 of 1990. The said appeal was filed against the order passed by the trial Court rejecting the application for temporary injunction. The trial Court's order is dated 23-8-1990.

3. In view of the decision of this Court in **Nagorao alias Arun s/o Narayan Yerawar and others v. Narayan Nagan Yerawar and another,** reported in 2002 (4) Mh.L.J. 615, no revision application lies against the order granting or refusing injunction. The law on the point being well-settled, the question of interference in the impugned order in revisional jurisdiction under Section 115 of the C.P.C. does not arise and hence applying the law laid down in **Nagorao's** case (supra) this revision application is liable to be dismissed and is accordingly hereby dismissed and the rule stands discharged with no order as to costs.